



Mandenkan

Bulletin semestriel d'études linguistiques mandé

51 | 2014

Grammatical Sketch of Beng

Complex sentences

Section 13

Denis Paperno



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/mandenkan/569>

DOI: 10.4000/mandenkan.569

ISSN: 2104-371X

Publisher

Llacan UMR 8135 CNRS/Inalco

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 June 2014

Number of pages: 89-101

ISSN: 0752-5443

Electronic reference

Denis Paperno, "Complex sentences", *Mandenkan* [Online], 51 | 2014, Online since 01 June 2014, connection on 03 March 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/mandenkan/569> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/mandenkan.569>

This text was automatically generated on 3 March 2021.



Les contenus de *Mandenkan* sont mis à disposition selon les termes de la Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Partage dans les Mêmes Conditions 4.0 International.

Complex sentences

Section 13

Denis Paperno

13.1. Postverbal embedded clauses

- 1 This chapter describes various types of complex sentences attested in Beng. Two types of subordinate clauses, complement and goal clauses, can be properly embedded inside another clause in a postverbal position inside the main clause, while temporal and conditional clauses occupy a position before the main clause.

13.1.1. Complement clauses

- 2 Complement clauses are marked by complementizers *kē*, *kēsá*, *sá* and *sá*, which appear to be mutually interchangeable. Often, the complement clause is coreferent with a 3SG pronoun in an argument position in the same clause:

(232)	Ī	à	pè	kē	mí	nū.
	1SG:PST+	3SG	say:L	that	2SG:PST+	come:L
	'I said that you had come' (literally 'I said it that you came').					

(233)	Ô-ó	ī	nì	kē	mì	nū.
	3SG-ST+	1SG	BENEF	that	2SG:HAB+	come
	'I want you to come' (literally 'It's for me that you come').					

- 3 Such Beng sentences with complement clauses are reminiscent of the English sentences with embedded clause extraposition, and the 3SG pronoun seems analogous to the dummy *it* in English. The pronoun is not always present in sentences with complement clauses, but only when required by the argument structure of the main predicate. For instance, the verb ‘to say’ as in (232) is transitive, and requires the direct object position to be filled in, and the subject position is obligatory in the volitive construction in (233). In contrast, the intransitive verb *wé* ‘to reply’ does not select for a direct or indirect object with the semantic role of content of response, and it combines with a complement clause without any ‘dummy’ pronoun present:

(234)	ó	wé	kē	à	nú	É.
	3SG:PST+	reply	that	3SG:PST-	come:L	NEG
	‘He replies that he wasn’t coming’.					

- 4 Furthermore, complement clauses can combine with arbitrary verbs, adding the speech component to the sentence meaning regardless of whether the main verb has anything to do with speech:

(235)	ó	bé	kē	ó	mlē	yē-nā.
	3SG:PST+	run:L	that	3SG:PST+	snake	see-PRF
	‘He was running saying that he had just seen a snake’ (literally: ‘He ran that he has seen a snake’).					

13.1.2. Goal clauses

- 5 The main strategy of marking goal clauses uses complementizer *nà* followed by a clause in optative mood:

(236)	Zrū́á	nà	mì	gbō	pí.
	hunker	for.to	2SG:HAB+	feces	excrete
	‘Hunker down in order to defecate’.				

(237)	ŋ-ó	sḡḡ	cí-cá-ló	nà	wà	wó	cá	ḡ	nì.
	1SG-ST+	person	search-PROG	for.to	3SG:HAB+3	IN	watch	1SG	BENEF
	‘I am looking for someone to read me this letter’.								

(238)	ŋ-ó	ŋùḗ	dǎ	nǎ	sḍḍḥ	bì-lè	ò	gā.
	1SG-ST+	fetish	fall	for.to	person	this-DEF	3SG:HAB+	die
'I will pray the fetish for this person to die'.								

- 6 Complementizer *nǎ* can be omitted if the subject or the direct object of the matrix clause is coreferent to one of the participants of the goal situation:

(239)	ŋ _i	kpḗ -pḍ	lù	ḥ	léḥ	gḍḥ	nḥ	(nǎ)
	1SG:PST+	play-Mns	buy:L	1SG	child	man	BENEF	for.to

ḥ _i	drḗ	wō	mḍdálé	lō.
1SG:HAB+	work	do	calmness	with
'I bought my son toys in order to work undisturbed'.				

(240)	ḥ	kḍpḗ _i	lù	ḥ	léḥ	gḍḥ	nḥ
	1SG:PST+	hoe	buy:L	1SG	child	man	BENEF

(nǎ)	ò	drḗ	wō	à _i	lō.
for.to	3SG:HAB+	work	do	3SG	with
'I bought my son a hoe to work with'.					

- 7 When such coreference does not hold, the complementizer is obligatory, compare (241) where the subject of the goal clause is not coreferent to the subject or the direct object of the matrix clause but to the indirect object:

(241)	ḥ	kḍpḗ	lù	ḥḥ	léḥ	gḍḥ	nḥ	nǎ / *ø	ò	drḗ	wō
	1SG:PST+	hoe	buy:L	1SG	child	man	BENEF	for.to	3SG:HAB+	work	do
'I bought my son a hoe in order for him to work'.											

- 8 Sometimes, the goal semantics is expressed with the complementizer *kḗ* followed by a sentence in optative mood, but it has an additional semantic component in addition to the goal. *kḗ* is only compatible with a verbalized goal:

(242)	ĩ	kópé	lù	ĩ	léĩ	gĩĩ
	1SG:PST+	hoe	buy:L	1SG	child	man

nĩ	kē	ò	drē	wō	à	lō.
BENEF	that	3SG:HAB+	work	do	3SG	with
'I bought my son a hoe (saying) that he should work with it'.						

- 9 Essentially, this goal usage of *kē* is a special case of its function, described in 13.1.1, of adding the speech component to the meaning of the sentence. The goal semantics in this case is just a pragmatic consequence of the optative.

13.2. Ways of encoding clausal arguments

- 10 Strategies of encoding clausal arguments include:

- complement clause with *kē* / *sá* / *kēsá*, with various matrix predicates:

(243)	ò-ó	pò	kē	mĩ	nũ.
	3SG-ST+	necessary	that	2SG:HAB+	come[BSQ]
	'You have to come'. (literally 'It is necessary that you come'.)				

(244)	Má	à	là	kē	ó	nũ?
	1SG:PST+	3SG	ask:L	that	3SG:PST+	come:L
	'I asked if he had come'.					

- nominalization is used in NP positions:

(245)	Mē	[mĩ	vĩĩ	dō-lē]	mā
	begin	2SG	hole	build-NMLZ	CONT
	'Start to dig your yam field!'				

(246)	ó	[sēwē	pē-lē]	tùà
	3SG:PST+	paper	say-NMLZ	leave:L

	'He stopped reading'.
--	-----------------------

- subordinate clauses with the goal complementizer *nǎ* or often asyndetical are used with predicates of causation:

(247)	À	túà	[ɲò	dr̥ɛ̃	wò].
	3SG	leave	3PL:HAB+	work	do
	'Make them work!'				

(248)	Ó	m̄	gblè	[nǎ	ɲ	tá	m̄	lō].
	3SG:PST+	2SG	force:L	for.to	1SG:HAB+	go	2SG	with
	'He forced you to go with me'.							

- verb phrases with verbs in the base form are used with the verb *zǐ* 'can':

(249)	Mǎ	zǐ	yātrɔ	flɔ̃ɔ̃	ɛ̃.
	1SG:HAB-	can:L	sit[BSQ]	today	NEG
	'I cannot sit today'.				

13.3. Serial construction

- 11 Beng has a very limited instantiation of the serial construction in the form of “*nǚ* or *tá* + verb phrase”. The verb *nǚ* ‘to come’ or *tá* ‘to go’ has the same morphological form as the second verb:

(250)	Ó	tá	à	wò.
	3SG :PST+	go:L	3SG	do:L
	'He went and did it'.			

- 12 Another constraint on the serial construction is that it is used only in those TAM values where the verbs are not marked by suffixes: in the preterite, the habitual, the optative, and the conditional; so the two verbs not only have identical form but the form is suffixless. In other TAM constructions (perfect, progressive, stative, and future) a goal converb (see 13.4) of the second verb is used instead of the serial construction with identical verb forms:

(251)	Ó	tá-nā	drē	*wō-nā	/*wō /	^{OK} wō-yā.
	3SG:PST+	go-PRF	work	do-PRF	do[BSQ]	do-GL
	'He went and worked / He went to work'.					

13.4. Converb constructions

- 13 A goal converb can depend on three verbs: with *tá* 'to go' and *nū* 'to come' it describes the goal of movement; with *bō* 'to come from' it depicts the subject's activity at the point of departure:

(252a)	ŋ	nū	drù-yā.
	1SG:PST+	come:L	walk-GL
	'I came to walk'.		

(252b)	(*ŋ)	drē	wò	drù-yā.
	1SG:PST+	work	do:L	walk-GL
	('I worked to walk'.)			

(253)	ŋ	bō	drù-yā.
	1SG:PST+	come.from:L	walk-GL
	'I came from a walk'.		

- 14 The goal converb cannot be separated from the motion verb by any constituent, behaving as a typical argument, rather than a modifier (see 12.2; compare (Gusev 2004)).
- 15 As mentioned in 6.2, the locative nominalization in *-ya* can be used to express action simultaneity, although this usage is rare:

(254)	ŋ-ó	jàtèlí	ké-ló	drù-yá.
	1SG-ST+	thought	V-PROG	walk-PLC
	'I am thinking while walking'.			

13.5. Temporal and conditional clauses

- 16 This section describes subordinate clauses that precede the main clause and are structurally outside of it. Goal and complement clauses that are embedded inside the main clause have already been characterized; interestingly, the preposed vs. embedded subordinate clauses are marked with two distinct positional classes of complementizers. Embedded clauses (such as goal clauses) have a complementizer on the left edge; preposed subordinate clauses have a complementizer on the right edge. The distinction follows the predictions of J. Hawkins' theory of word order whereby the head of a subordinate constituent should gravitate towards linear proximity to the head of the superordinate phrase (Hawkins 1990).

13.5.1. Temporal clause: the topic construction

- 17 It is noteworthy that two common constructions (not counting juxtaposition) that express temporal relations between clauses are marked exactly like information structure relations of topic and focus. The main temporal complementizer is *ng*, identical to the topic marker:

(255)	<u>Gbǒŋ</u>	<u>ó</u>	<u>tá</u>	<u>pǒú</u>	<u>ná</u>	<u>ó</u>	<u>zrá</u>	<u>kléŋ</u>	<u>nì</u>	<u>wó.</u>
	Gbong	3SG:PST+	go	field	TOP	3SG:PST+	get.lost	forest	DEF	IN

- 18 'Gbond went to the field and got lost in the forest' (literally: 'When Gbond went to the field, he got lost in the forest'. Beng's fields are often located quite far from their villages, and there are even special temporary settlements for people working in those remote fields.)

(256)	ŋ	nú	ná	ŋ	zrô.
	1SG:PST+	come:L	TOP	1SG:PST+	wash:L
	'I came and washed' (literally: 'When I came, I washed').				

- 19 The selection of TAM values in the main clause (after *ná*) follows general TAM semantics. TAM marking in the embedded clause adheres to special rules. If the situation of the subordinate clause precedes that of the main clause, as in (256), the preterite construction is used in the subordinate clause. Simultaneity of the two situations is marked in the subordinate clause by the future (sic!) construction, which has in this case progressive interpretation, or with a semantically appropriate construction with default present time reference (stative, adverbial clause, etc.). Clearly, this usage of the future construction reflects the fact that the future construction historically had a progressive meaning, even though it was replaced in the core progressive contexts by a newly grammaticized form in *-leló*, and was only retained in subordinate contexts and as a future form. Compare (255) and (257a):

(257a)	Gbǎǎ	ò-ó	tá	pǎú	nǎ	ó	zrà	kléǎ	nǎ	wó.
	Gbong	3SG-ST+	go	field	TOP	3SG:PST+	get.lost	forest	DEF	IN
'Gbong got lost when he was going to the field'.										

(257b)	ŋ-ó	klóó	nǎ,	ǎ	dā	ò
	1SG-ST+	little	TOP	1SG	mother	3SG:HAB+

gbéné	lè	zǎ	fǎ	dōdō.
manioc	DEF	pound	day	some
'When I was little my mother would pound manioc sometimes'.				

- 20 Finally, conditional mood is used in the sense of habitual aspect:

(258)	Gbǎǎ	ô	tá	pǎú	nǎ	ò	zrà	kléǎ	nǎ	wó.
	Gbong	3SG:CND+	go	field	TOP	3SG:HAB+	get.lost:L	forest	DEF	IN
'When Gbong goes to the field he usually gets lost in the forest'.										

- 21 Particle $f\bar{e}$ when added to a temporal clause gives it a conditional flavor, which can be expressed in English with the complementizer *since*:

(259)	[F \bar{e}	ā	pè	wà-ā	tá	é	nǎ],	dé
	Rel	3SG:PST+3	say:L	3SG-ST-	go	NEG	TOP	who

ó	blǎ	nǎ	ò	à	bē	srá	ē?
ST+	here	for.to	3SG:HAB+	3SG	trace	take	FOC
'Since he said he's not going, who's here to replace him?'							

13.5.2. Temporal subordinate clause: the focus construction

- 22 Temporal sequence of two clauses can also be marked by a special construction marked in the same way as the focus construction: clause A + $n\bar{e}$ + clause C + \bar{e} , meaning 'A, then C'. Example:

(260)	[ŋó	kpàŋ	nùŋ	ŋò	srà]	ɲɛ̃
	3PL:PST	whip	PL	3PL	take:L	FOC

[ŋó	nú	àŋmô	mɛ̃	kpà]	ɛ̃.
3PL:PST+	come:L	hyena	beat:L	much	FOC
‘They took whips and then came and beat the hyena hard’.					

13.5.3. Conditional clause

- 23 The structure of conditional clauses is protasis + conditional complementizer + apodosis. There are two conditional complementizers, *dɛ̃ɛ̃*, used with protasis in affirmative polarity and *nĩ*, used with negated protasis. Before the protasis one can also find an optional marker *fɛ̃* or *ò dɔ̃ kɛ̃*, literally ‘let it be set that...’
- 24 TAM marking in the apodosis follows the general semantics of TAM. Protasis exhibits some special rules of TAM marking:
- in case of a condition in the past or present that the speaker believes can be true (‘real conditional’), the same TAM constructions are used as in independent clauses:

(261)	Fɛ̃	wǎ	mlɔ̃	à	lō	ɛ̃	nĩ
	Rel	3SG:PST-	meet:L	3SG	with	NEG	if.NEG

wà-ā	à	jrɛ̃ŋ	dɔ̃-lɛ̃	ɛ̃.
3SG-ST-	3SG	enough	know-RES	NEG

- 25 ‘If he didn’t meet her he doesn’t know much’ (the protasis exhibits regular preterite construction);
- in case of a condition in the future or a habitual condition without concrete time reference (‘potential conditional’), protasis is marked with conditional mood (or more rarely with the appropriate indicative TAM constructions, future or habitual):

(262a)	Fɛ̃	ô	srɔ̃	dɛ̃ɛ̃	ŋó	nũ	gbɔ̃.
	Rel	3SG:CND	arrive	if	1SG-ST+	come	also
	‘If he comes I am coming too’.						

(262b)	Mĩ	gō	sɔ̃ŋ	mà	dɛ̃ɛ̃	Ẽ́:ćí	è	ó	mĩ	yē-lè.
--------	----	----	------	----	-------	--------	---	---	----	--------

	2SG:CND	hide	person	CONT	if	sky	DEF	ST+	2SG	see-RES
	'If you hide from people, God still sees you;'									

- in case of a condition that the speaker believes to be false (counterfactual condition), protasis is marked with optative mood when referring to past events, or appropriate indicative forms when referring to the present. Besides TAM, counterfactual conditionals are obligatorily marked with particle *ḡḡō* after the conditional complementizer (this particle can also optionally appear with potential future conditions that only possibly can be false).

Example:

(263)	<i>ḡ</i>	<i>yí</i>	<i>ḡí-lé</i>	<i>lú</i>	<i>déē</i>
	1SG:HAB+	water	cool-NMLZ	buy[BSQ]	if

<i>ḡḡō</i>	<i>wálí</i>	<i>wā</i>	<i>ḡ</i>	<i>wōlì</i>	<i>drē</i>	<i>é.</i>
NGO	money	ST-	1SG	POSS	anymore	NEG
	'If I had bought cold water, I wouldn't have money anymore'.					

(protasis is marked with optative mood expressed by a combination of a habitual subject pronoun with the base form of the verb).

13.6. Relative clause

- 26 Discussion in this section follows (Paperno 2008b), omitting the relativizing function of nominalizations that have been briefly characterized in sections 6.2, 6.3, 6.6, and 6.7.

13.6.1. Head-external relative construction

- 27 Relative clauses are marked with the combination of a preposed particle *fē* (which can also be thought of as a relative determiner, see 13.6.2 for arguments to this effect) and a postposed marker *nḡ* that equals the topic marker. The *nḡ* element can be omitted before a pause, and is always omitted before another *nḡ* marker in the topic-marking function. The relativized position in the relative clause is filled by a resumptive pronoun that agrees in person and number with the head NP if a pronoun is possible in the given position or left empty otherwise. Rarely, when the noun phrase is topicalized and separated by a pause, the complementizer can, but does not have to, be omitted (264b).
- 28 As mentioned above, the most common complementizer in relative clauses is *nḡ*. Relative clauses can also employ a conditional complementizer *déē* / *ḡī* (*déē* occurs after affirmative conditional clauses and *ḡī* after negative conditional clauses). Relative clauses with the conditional (*déē*) differ in meaning from the main type of relative clauses (with *nḡ*) and include a conditional element in their semantics (246d). Unlike in

relative clauses with *nǵ*, the statement expressed by a relative clause with a conditional is not presupposed to be true. Relative clauses with *dÉĒ* (examples 264d,e) can be roughly rendered in English using words *whenever*, *whichever*, etc. All of the following examples come from real texts; all of them feature topicalization of the whole relative construction.

- 29 The conditional construction can be used to modify a noun with reference to a future event (264e), even when there is no sense of uncertainty as to whether this event will happen (uncertainty as to whether condition would hold seems to be a common meaning element of English conditionals). Compare (264e) to an analogous example but with a past event in the relative clause (264f), and no conditionality involved (the relative clause is presupposed true); *nǵ* is used in this case. Examples:

(264a)	Ó	bìànâ	[fĒ]	ǵó	à	klà	Kuàsí	ǵí	nǵ	klùǵ.
	3SG:PST+	banana	Rel	3SG:PST+	3SG	put	Kouassi	APUD	TOP	steal:L
	'He stole the banana that had been put next to Kouassi'.									

(264b)	ZrĒ	[fĒ	mǐ-ó	à	yé] _i	mǐ	mǐ	[zrĒ	bì-Ē] _i	yā.
	way	Rel	2SG-ST+	3SG	on	2SG:HAB+	2SG	way	this-DEF	walk
	‘Walk on the way you’re standing on’.									

(264c)	ǵ	bábá	nùǵ	[fĒ]	mǵ	ǵò	dÉǵ	nǵ]	ǵmā	ǵò	yǵǵ.
	1SG	sheep	PL	Rel	2SG:PST+	3PL	kill:L	TOP	1SG:give	3PL	other
	'Give me the replacement for the sheep you killed'.										

(264d)	PǵbĒ	[fĒ]	ǵ	yōnó	dÉĒ]	wà	zìn	ǵō	É.
	scar	Rel	3SG:ST+	forehead	if	3SG:HAB-	can:L	hide	NEG
	'You can't hide a scar on your forehead' (literally: 'Whichever scar is on a forehead, it can't be hidden').								

(264e)	Yrámǵ	[fĒ]	bàāǵǵǵǵǵǵ	lè	ô	pǵ	dÉĒ]	wà	mǵ	wálÉ	lè	ǵá.
	time	Rel	end.of.rain.season	DEF	3SG:CND	come	if	3SG:HAB-	2SG:HAB+	yam	DEF	pick

- 30 'When the rain season ends, gather yams' (literally: 'whenever there's end of the rain season, gather yams').

(264f)	Gblē	[fĒ]	ǵ	zīē	yǵ	ló	wē	cà
--------	------	------	---	-----	----	----	----	----

	yesterday	Rel	1SG:PST+	kapok	this	on	there	look
--	-----------	-----	----------	-------	------	----	-------	------

śíj	ná]	j	dóbà	dō	yè	wē.
closely	TOP	1SG:PST+	monkey	one	see:L	there
'Yesterday while watching this kapok tree closely, I saw a monkey there'.						

13.6.2. Head-internal $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ -construction with $d\acute{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}$ and other arguments for treating $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ -constructions as originally head-internal

- 31 Some properties of $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ suggest that it is not simply a relative clause marker but a relative determiner. For instance, before $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$, the definite article $l\grave{\epsilon}$ is blocked. After a demonstrative, $l\grave{\epsilon}$ is generally required, but $l\grave{\epsilon}$ is absent in the presence of a relative clause, cf. (265a) vs. (265b).

(265a)	[P̄]	bì	$f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$	mí	à	lù	ná] _{NP}	wà-ā	$g\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}$	é.
	thing	this	Rel	2SG:PST+	3SG	buy:L	TOP	3SG-ST-	good	NEG
'This thing that you bought, it is not pretty'.										

(265b)	P̄	bì	*(lḡ)	wà-ā	$g\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}$	é.
	thing	this	DEF	3SG-ST-	good	NEG
'This thing is not pretty'.						

- 32 The interaction of $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ -relativization with the expression of the definite article can be explained if $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ is, at least historically, a determiner occupying the same position as the article $l\grave{\epsilon}$. And $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ does occupy the position of a determiner (after the head noun) in a rare variant of the relativization construction with $d\acute{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}$, in which a head NP with $f_{\bar{\epsilon}}$ is found within the relative clause (such constructions are head internal):

(265c)	[Ō]	[pɔ̌]	$f_{\bar{\epsilon}}]_{NP}$	srá	dε̌ε̌]	wà	klà	à	bε̌ló	ε̌.
	3SG:CND	thing	Rel	take	if	3SG:HAB-	put:L	3SG	place	NEG
'He doesn't put things where they belong' (literally: 'whatever thing he takes, he doesn't put it in its place').										

(265d)	[T̄]	wā	[sɔ̌]	$f_{\bar{\epsilon}}]_{NP}$	mā	é	n̄]	yròbítà	wà	sɔ̌bì	ε̌.
--------	------	----	-------	----------------------------	----	---	-----	---------	----	-------	-----

	curse	ST-	person	Rel	on	NEG	if	water.snake	3SG:HAB-3	bite:L	NEG
	'If there's no curse on a person, a water snake won't bite him' (literally: 'If a curse is not on whichever person...').										

(265e)	[Mî]	wlō	[gbě]	fě̃ _{NP}	wó	dě̃
	2SG:CND	move	village	Rel	in	if

ɲà	gbōpì	à	yé	é.
3PL:HAB-	defecate:L	3SG	in	NEG

- 33 'One doesn't defecate in the village one is moving from' (literally: 'whatever village you are moving from ...').
- 34 These examples suggest that even when the head noun is outside the relative clause, $f_{\bar{e}}$ might still be a determiner of the head NP.
- 35 Another instance of head internal relativization can be seen in relative clauses with presentative markers like è 'this is':

(265f)	[[pō]	fě̃ _{NP}	è	ná _{RelP}	wà-ā	pō	bì-lè	dō-lè	é
	thing	Rel	this.is	TOP	3SG-ST-	thing	this-DEF	know-RES	NEG
	'This thing (lit. the thing that this is), he doesn't know this thing'.								

- 36 Since è cannot function as a full sentence on its own, we have to assign this relative clause a structure where the head noun is its subject. This construction is essentially idiomatic, functioning as a complex demonstrative. Such demonstrative relativizations form a closed class, so they could be treated as lexicalized relics of head-internal $f_{\bar{e}}$ -relativization.
- 37 An additional piece of evidence comes from topicalization of phrases modified by relative clauses. Such topicalized phrases are never accompanied by an additional topic marker (ná), to which the complementizer ná at the end of relative clauses is phonologically identical. The topic marker ná can often be omitted, but it is usually present in topicalization of adverbial elements (265h). However, such a topic marker is not introduced if the topicalized adverbial is modified by a relative clause, compare (265g) vs. (265h). Topic markers are not used after relative clauses with the complementizer dě̃, either, compare (265i) vs. (265j).

(265g)	[Flōō]	[fě̃]	à	léj	ñì	ó	ñ	wōlì	ná _{RelP}
	today	Rel	3SG	child	DEF	ST+	1SG	at	TOP

\bar{y}	$\bar{v}\bar{i}$ -lí	è.
1SG	love-AG	this.is
'Today when I have her daughter she is my friend'.		

(265h)	$[F\bar{i}\bar{z}\bar{o}]_{NP}$	$n\bar{a}$,	\bar{y}	$\bar{v}\bar{i}$ -lí	è.
	today	TOP	1SG	love-AG	this.is
	'Today she is my friend'.				

(265i)	$[F\bar{e}]$	$d\bar{o}]_{NP}$	$n\bar{a}$	$m\bar{i}$	$n\bar{a}$	à	$\bar{l}\bar{o}$	$k\bar{a}$	$b\bar{l}\bar{e}$	$m\bar{u}\bar{y}$.
	day	one	TOP	2SG	and	3SG	with	2SG:HAB+	agree:L	again
	'Some day you and she agree again'.									

(265j)	$[F\bar{e}]$	$[f\bar{e}]$	à	$t\bar{e}t\bar{e}$	ó	à	$b\bar{o}$	à	$y\bar{u}o$
	day	Rel	3SG	self	3SG:CND+	3SG	take	3SG	mouth

$k\bar{e}$	$m\bar{a}$	$s\bar{i}$	$n\bar{a}$	$d\bar{e}\bar{e}]_{RelNP}$
that	1SG:PST+3	take	Perf	if

$m\bar{i}$	$n\bar{a}$	à	$\bar{l}\bar{o}$	$k\bar{a}$	$b\bar{l}\bar{e}$	$m\bar{u}\bar{y}?$
2SG	and	3SG	with	2SG:HAB+	agree:L	again
'The day she (mother-in-law) says "I took her (your wife) away", will you and she agree again?'						

- 38 The facts outlined above can be given a straightforward interpretation: the relativization marker $f\bar{e}$ is, at least historically, a determiner; the most widespread relativization strategy features an extraction of the NP with $f\bar{e}$ from the relative clause.
- 39 The original syntax of relative clauses could have been correlative which is still found in the cases discussed above, examples (265c-265f):

$[...[N f\bar{e}]_{NP} ... Comp]_{S_2}$

with the option of topicalizing the $f\bar{e}$ noun phrase:

$[[N f\bar{e}]_{NP} ... Comp]_{S_2}$, cf. example (265j).

These types of sentences could have been reanalyzed as involving a topicalized noun phrase with a relative clause, extracted from the main clause S_2 :

$[N [f\bar{e} ... Comp]_{NP}]_{S_2}$

Undoing such topicalization gives the basic relativization pattern:

$[...[N [f\bar{e} ... Comp]_{NP}...]_{S_2}$, see example (264a).

The development proposed here is reminiscent of the scenario proposed by Nikitina (2012) for what she labels as ‘the rise of clause-internal correlatives’ in Southeastern Mande languages.

- 40 To summarize the argument of this section, relative clauses in Beng are originally head-internal, at least in the historical sense. The argument can also be interpreted in favor of analyzing relative clauses as originally head-internal in syntactic derivation (Kayne 1994). Historical and derivational interpretations of head-internal syntax of relative clauses are compatible but not isomorphic, reminiscent of the relation between historical and derivational processes in phonology.
- 41 There is one argument in favor of the historical rather than synchronic interpretation of the head-internal status of Beng relative clauses. One important piece of evidence used in the argument above was that the determiner *lè* is not used in the presence of a relative clause marker *fɛ̃*. However, the definite article *n̩* (variant of *lè* after /*ɲ*/, see 8.3), is attested before *fɛ̃*:

(265k)	<i>ɲ̩</i>	<i>baba</i>	<i>lè</i>	<i>à</i>	<i>sán̩ɲ̩</i>	<i>lɛ́</i>		<i>[a]</i>
	1SG	sheep	DEF	3SG	mark	3SG:PST+:COP:L	3SG	

<i>blɛ̃ɲ̩</i>	<i>trɔ̃ɲ̩</i>	<i>n̩</i>	<i>[fɛ̃]</i>	<i>ò</i>	<i>ɕí-lɛ̃ɲ̩</i>	<i>n̩</i> _{NP}	<i>ɛ̃.</i>
left	ear	DEF	Rel	3SG:ST+	cut-RES	TOP	FOC
‘The mark of my sheep is its left ear which is cut’.							

- 42 Examples like this suggest that the incompatibility of *fɛ̃* and determiners is not strict, and the determiner status of *fɛ̃* might not be synchronically valid but could rather be a historical relic.

AUTHOR

DENIS PAPERNO

University of Trento, Italy
denis.paperno@gmail.com